



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/589,171

08/11/2006

Stefan Andersson

9564-17

6861

54414

7590

07/02/2009

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC, P.A.

P.O. BOX 37428

RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER

CHAI, LONGBIT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2431

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/02/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/589,171	Applicant(s) ANDERSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner LONGBIT CHAI	Art Unit 2431	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Currently pending claims are 1 – 35.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the subject matter of the instant claims have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

3. As per claim 1, Applicant asserts (a) the access rights that are defined by preloaded attribute certificates in Anderson do not disclose or render obvious the recitations of Claim 1 and (b) the downloaded object includes access permissions and other permission information to be associated with policy contained in the downloaded object as well as access permissions already existing in the apparatus (Remarks: Page 12 / 2nd Para) and (c) the object enhancing the application interface with the new routines and/or new functions (Remarks: Page 11 / 1st Para). Examiner respectfully disagrees with the following rationale:

- Regarding issue (a), Anderson teaches (i) attribute certificates are downloaded as well together with the downloaded objects to control the download application / function access permission (i.e. digital rights) (Anderson: Column 2 Line 50 – 54) and besides, (ii) the attribute certificates (i.e. access rights) can be built into the smart card at the manufacturer (i.e. pre-loaded) or can be download over the air into the smart card to allow the service provider to update the certificates (i.e. access rights) (Anderson: Column 4 Line 35 – 40).
- Regarding issue (a), Anderson also teaches the download attribute certificate contains at least other permission information specifying a generic profile that controls one or several other applications to be associated with the profile such as signature,

Art Unit: 2431

issuer and validity about access rights (Anderson: Column 3 Line 54 – Column 4 Line 2) and as such Anderson does teach the downloaded object includes access permissions and other permission information to be associated with policy contained in the downloaded object as well as access permissions already existing in the apparatus.

- Regarding issue (a), Anderson teaches the user can download the new functions or applications such as tools to upgrade the user device / apparatus (e.g. telephone) application interface ((Anderson: Column 2 Line 39 – 41).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

NOTE: The term "others" in 35 U.S.C. 102(a) refers to any entity which is different from the inventive entity. The entity need only differ by one person to be "by others." This holds true for all types of references eligible as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) including publications as well as public knowledge and use.

4. Claims 1 – 3 and 9 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Anderson (EP 1361527 A1).

As per claim 1 and 18, Anderson teaches a method of providing a dynamic security management in an apparatus, the apparatus comprising:

a platform for running an application (Anderson: Figure 1);

a security manager for handling access of the application to functions existing in the apparatus (Anderson: Figure 1 / Element 7);

Art Unit: 2431

an application interface between the platform and the application (Anderson: Figure 1 / Element 4: API (Application Interface));

a set of access permissions stored in the apparatus and used by the security manager for controlling access of the application to functions through the application interface (Anderson: Column 3 Line 12 – 24) **the method comprising:**

downloading into the apparatus an object containing access permissions and other permission information to be associated with policy contained in the downloaded object as well as access permissions already existing in the apparatus, wherein the permissions are applicable to at least one function, the object comprising new routines and/or new functions (Anderson: Column 2 Line 39 – 41 / Line 50 – 54, Column 3 Line 12 – 19 and Column 3 Line 54 – Column 4 Line 2: the download attribute certificate along with the downloaded objects to control access permission (i.e. digital rights) contains at least other permission information specifying a generic profile that controls one or several other applications to be associated with the profile such as signature, issuer and validity about access rights);

verifying the object (Anderson: Column 4 Line 21 – 24); and

installing the access permissions together with the existing permissions, the object enhancing the application interface with the new routines and/or new functions (Anderson: Column 4 Line 28 – 30).

As per claim 14 and 31, Anderson teaches a method of providing a dynamic security management in an apparatus, the apparatus comprising:

a platform for running an application (Anderson: Figure 1);

Art Unit: 2431

a security manager for handling access of the application to functions existing in the apparatus (Anderson: Figure 1 / Element 7);

an application interface between the platform and the application (Anderson: Figure 1 / Element 4: API (Application Interface));

a set of access permissions stored in the apparatus and used by the security manager for controlling access of the application to functions through the application interface (Anderson: Column 3 Line 12 – 24 and Column 2 Line 50 – 54), the method comprising:

storing the access permissions in a security policy (Anderson: Column 4 Line 49 – 58 and Column 3 Line 56 – 58: access permission information is indeed related to a security policy); and

providing the security policy with a hierarchical structure (Anderson: Column 4 Line 49 – 58 / Line 3 – 30 and Figure 2: (a) a hierarchical structure of a set of root-certificates and attribute certificates; (b) where the root-certificate is mapped to an attribute certificate through an identifier (e.g. public key)).

As per claim 2 and 19, Anderson teaches the object is verified by checking a certificate chain of the object (Anderson: Column 4 Line 20 – 38).

As per claim 3 and 20, Anderson teaches verifying that a policy of the function allows updates (Anderson: Column 3 Line 20 – 24 and Column 4 Line 35 – 38).

As per claim 9 and 26, Anderson teaches the access permissions are contained in a policy file (Anderson: Column 3 Line 56 – 58: access permission information is indeed related to a security policy).

Art Unit: 2431

As per claim 10 and 27, Anderson teaches the policy file has a structure linking access levels of existing functions with a domain associated with the downloaded object (Anderson: Column 4 Line 4 – 57: (a) permission rights must be associated with an access level according to a security policy and (b) a set of structures (e.g., permission certificates) are linked with an identifier (e.g., signature / public key identifier), which is qualified as a domain ID – i.e. a group / domain of mapped certificates).

As per claim 11, 16, 28 and 33, Anderson teaches the policy file has a structure linking access levels of existing functions with information contained in a certificate chain (Anderson: Column 4 Line 20 – 38 and Column 4 Line 4 – 57).

As per claim 12, 17, 29 and 34, Anderson teaches the information includes a signature of the end entity certificate, a signature of an intermediate certificate, or specific level information (level OID) (Anderson: Column 4 Line 19 – 24: a signature).

As per claim 13 and 30, Anderson teaches the policy file has a structure including logical expressions (Anderson: Column 4 Line 50 – 54: a file structure indeed includes logical expressions).

As per claim 15 and 32, Anderson teaches the security policy has a structure linking access levels of existing functions with a domain associated with the downloaded object (Anderson: Column 4 Line 4 – 57 / Line 20 – 38: (a) permission rights must be associated with an access level according to a security policy and (b) a set of structures (e.g., permission

Art Unit: 2431

certificates) are linked with an identifier (e.g., signature / public key identifier), which is qualified as a domain ID – i.e. a group / domain of mapped certificates).

As per claim 35, Anderson teaches the apparatus is a portable telephone, a pager, a communicator, a smart phone, or an electronic organizer (Anderson: Column 2 Line 37 – 41).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4 – 8 and 21 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (EP 1361527 A1), in view of Yarsa et al. (U.S. Patent 6,760,912).

As per claim 4, 7, 21 and 24, Anderson does not disclose expressly installing a library comprising new routines and/or new functions to be called by an application or another library stored in the apparatus to enable access of functions through the application interface.

Yarsa teaches installing a library comprising new routines and/or new functions to be called by an application or another library stored in the apparatus to enable access of functions through the application interface (Yarsa: Column 3 Line 9 – 20: DLL Library routines called by an applet class application program with built-in security mechanism).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Yarsa within the system of Anderson because

Art Unit: 2431

(a) Anderson teaches a security mechanism of defining a generic profile for controlling an interface in connection with applications so that the application is allowed limited access to existing software / function through an interface (Anderson: Column 3 Line 55 – 58 and Column 2 Line 50 – 54), and (b) Yarsa teaches an improved security mechanism on API (Application Interface) by providing functions with built-in dynamic link library (.DLL), namely, native code library, and accessed through the Java Native Interface (JNI) by a class that has access rights to load DLL library codes (Yarsa: Column 3 Line 9 – 20: DLL Library routines called by an applet class application program with built-in security mechanism).

As per claim 5, 8, 22 and 25, Anderson as modified teaches the new routines and/or new functions can access existing functions through the library (Yarsa: Column 3 Line 9 – 20).

As per claim 6 and 23, Anderson as modified teaches when accessing functions, recursively checks the permissions of the application interfaces and libraries in a linked chain related to the called functions (Yarsa: Column 3 Line 9 – 20).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2431

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LONGBIT CHAI whose telephone number is (571)272-3788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William R. Korzuch can be reached on 571-272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Longbit Chai/

Longbit Chai E.E. Ph.D
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431
7/01/2009